Sri B. NANJAPPA (Gandasi).—I request that the precincts of the Assembly can be extended by the Speaker also because it is stated here "such other places as the Speaker may from time to time specify." So no amendment is necessary and the Speaker can extend the precincts of the Assembly during the session.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon'ble member must remember that if I do it today, what happened yesterday and the day before yesterday cannot be covered. That is why I said that if any member has got anything to add, I am prepared to hold it over. I cannot give a ruling which is inconsistent with the existing rules.

Sri V. N. PATIL.—Sir, the decision may be deferred for some time.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is what I suggested. If the member wants more time, I have no objection. Yesterday he was not agreeable to its being dealt with today. I want to help members by giving certain books. I will give more books if necessary. Let them study and then make their remarks.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT.—Sir, you may defer the question for more detailed consideration later on.

ADJOURNMENT MOTION *Re*: HUNGER STRIKE, ETC., BY EMPLOYEES OF A PRIVATE COMPANY—SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now, there is a matter regarding what is called hunger strike and lock-out, Mr. Krishnan and two others. I believe Sri Bola Raghurama Shetty and others, have sought to raise it. I will deal with the matter so far as the question of adjournment motion is concerned.

Sri V. N. PATIL.—Sir, my submission is that this is the one forum through which we members can prevail upon the Government to consider the just demands of the employees and give them interim relief. These are the demands to which they are entitled to and we want to stress this on the Government through this adjournment motion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon'ble member Sri V. N. Patil and others have sought to raise a discussion on an adjournment motion on account of the strike and hunger or fast that is going on in connection with a limited liability company and its workers. The point urged is that the Government may kindly consider and give them what are their dues or at least as an interim relief. So far as the merits of the claim and the procedure to be adopted for obtaining the relief is concerned, it stands on a different footing. I am concerned with its admissibility or otherwise as an adjournment motion. It is not disputed that the workers are not workers under the Government, but working in a factory which I believe is a limited liability and autonomous institution.

Matters relating to the internal administrtion, day to day administration and claims of workers are not directly under the control of the Government for which the Government could be held responsible to the Legislature and the debate to be allowed thereon.

Further it has time and again been held that so far as fast is concerned, even if it were from the staff of the Government, it could not be a proper matter for an adjournment motion. In this House itself on 14th October 1955 the then hon'ble member Sri S. Gopal Gowda moved a motion that there was a fast which was going on and it might be admitted to be raised as an adjournment motion. The Speaker ruled that it cannot possibly be admitted. He observed : "Hon'ble members are doubtless aware that the admission of an adjournment motion so as to interrupt the appointed order of business is subject to certain well-considered rules and conventions. On many occasions in the past we had discussed this question at some length. So far as the present motion is concerned, it is difficult to hold that the subject is of such public importance as to require interruption of the appointed business. Secondly, the grant of licence which is in accordance with the Mining Act and the rules there under is an order passed in the ordinary administration of law. There are other parliamentary opportunities available to hon'ble members to debate this question and this is not the only way." In fact, these fasts have time and again come up before the Houses of Legislature. on 13th August 1951 it has been ruled in another Legislature that unless there is a responsibility of the Government involved it would not be a case fit for admission as adjournment motion. That was on a matter of hunger strike by a great man whose name I do not want to mention here and it was said there that hunger strikes are not proper subjects for adjournment motion. Then, again. in the House of People on 6th May 1953, 6th August 1953. and 8th December 1952 and time and again it has been ruled that hunger strikes and lockouts are not matters for adjournment motion.

Sri S. S. SHETTAR (Hubli).—Sir, I had given a Call Attention Notice about transport facilities and interim relief to workers of the New Government Electric Factory. In view of its importance, it is better that a statement is made by the Hon'ble Minister, who is here, on this issue.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will look into it. The number of Calling Attention Notices received up till now will suffice for another ten days. Some sort of other arrangement has to be brought if you want to tackle the subject on the floor of the House. I will try to help you. Even if I were to admit it, there are hardly 3 days more.

Sri S. S. SHETTAR.—Looking to its importance, it may be included in tomorrow's agenda, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Repeated request on the same topic!